

The Converted Catholic

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Editor and Publisher

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke 22: 32.

Vol. XXX

JUNE, 1913

No. 6

EDITORIAL NOTES

God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.—John 4: 24.

The doctrine of this text is as profound as it is logical. Only by the aid of prayer and the Spirit of God can we hope to sound its profundity; for it extends beyond the reach of our limited human faculties. This is why only he who is born again can discern its mysteries, and he who is faithful and constant in the spiritual life can fathom its meaning and grow by this knowledge.

The logic of it is apparent when we examine the doctrines of Christianity by its light.

God is a Spirit. If, speaking in philosophical language, we say that similar things attract each other, and dissimilar things repel each other, it is clear that, God being a Spirit, only that which is spiritual can be acceptable to Him.

Therefore Christ, having come to destroy sin, which is the dominion of the flesh over the spirit, pronounced it to be an indispensable requirement of the spiritual life that we be "born again." And He gives us the reason for this when He says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." There is an absolute line of division here. There is no reforming of nature by a gradual process; there is no "uplifting of the masses," nor even a change of heart. Here there is nothing less than the death of the "old man" and the birth of a "new creature" in Christ Jesus, born of the Spirit of God. That which is born of the flesh, it matters not how

highly polished it may become through culture, philosophy and social progress, remains flesh.

One of the difficulties which very frequently presents itself to the soul that loves and seeks the spiritual life is the difficulty of knowing the Divine will in relation to itself. "If I were only *sure* as to what the will of God is," that soul will say, "I would do it; but I am not sure." The text we are meditating is the interpretation of the will of God. Everything which in itself is opposed to the nature of God is contrary to His will; and we know that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.

We cannot say that God reigns absolutely in us while there remains in us a desire, an affection, which, because it is contrary to the nature of God, is repulsive to Him. This same argument, therefore, will help us to recognize that which is pleasing to Him.

Not a few who are less scrupulous than those who experience the former difficulty go to the opposite extreme. Measuring God and His attributes by the measure of human nature they take it for granted that God cannot think or act otherwise than they themselves think or act. To them it seems that God must agree with the rules of human prudence, and, therefore, that He makes light of human frailties.

The Roman Church is to a great degree responsible for this in the distinction she makes between venial and mortal sins, by which she subjects God to human standards of judgment. She also makes it appear by her teachings that perfection is a condition arbitrarily required by God, and not a state necessary according to His nature, for union with Him.

The Gospel is very definite in this matter. Only the pure in heart can see God, and there is no purity of heart without the "new," or spiritual, birth.

Our text connects the definition of God with the worship due to Him; in other words, it tells us what we can offer acceptably to Him who is a Spirit.

In our next number we hope to continue the study of this subject.

"THE POPE IS GOD"

The following article, translated by "The Bulwark" from the Paris newspaper "Le Matin," has been withheld from republication for the benefit of our readers until we could convince ourselves of its startlingly blasphemous doctrine which has been echoed approvingly by several Spanish and Hispano-American Roman Catholic periodicals. This carrying out of Rome's doctrine of the infallibility of the pope to its logical conclusion will, no doubt, edify our readers. It recalls to our mind the prophecy made years ago by Flammarion, the celebrated French astronomer and author, that the next Vatican council would declare the divinity of the pope as a dogma:

"THE POPE IS GOD!"

Affirms, from Analogy, the Religious Weekly of Perigueux.

This Doctrine is referred to the Holy See.

The Opinion of a Theologian.

In its issue of the 7th December, the "Semaine Religieuse," of Perigueux, in an article entitled "The Pope has Wept," one reads the following strange lines:

"The pope, in our estimation, is a sacrament; that is to say, Jesus incarnate anew; and living in the heart of His Church to keep it, and to guide it.

"I am with thee, Peter, to the end of time"; this was said by Jesus. Equally affirmative, why should it not have the same effect as the formula of the eucharistic consecration, 'This is My body'?

"So, then, when the pope weeps, his tears are the tears likewise of Jesus."

We have asked a theologian of noted orthodoxy, What, from a Roman Catholic point of view, is right to think about this curious doctrine?

"You may announce," said he, "that the article in question has just been referred to the Holy See.

"It is true that Monseigneur Mermillod preached not long ago, without being disavowed, on the triple incarnation of Christ—1st, in the womb of the Virgin Mary; 2d, in the eucharist; 3d, in the pope. But in what concerns the pope, he did not mean a real incarnation; he expressed himself metaphorically. Here, it is another matter, for the 'Semaine Religieuse' of Perigueux expressly assimilates to the real presence of the Christ—God in the eucharist—the divine assistance promised to Saint Peter, and to the successors of Saint Peter. It is exactly as if it said, 'The Pope is God,' and truly this is going rather far.

"The late Abbé Perriot, himself director of 'L'Ami du Clergé,' and theologian, so to speak, the most Ultramontane that we have ever known, did not dare go so far as that; he was satisfied to uphold the sinlessness of the pope; and to those who upbraided him with certain pages of ecclesiastical history, it was his custom to answer, 'It is very simple; when a pope misconducts himself, when he has sinned, you may be sure that he was not a true pope, and that there was some defect of form in his election.' But he did not teach the divinity of the pope. We are decidedly in an era of progress."

A ROMAN DEFINITION OF PROTESTANTISM

An Article Published in the Roman Catholic Periodical "La Luz" (The Light), Arequipa, Peru, S. America.

We present the following in the belief that it will interest our readers to know what Roman authorities teach their people about Protestantism. This is a characteristic Roman production. It perverts history at every point, and is false in every statement. Romanists are forbidden to read Protestant books, and they are fed on this kind of false instruction. Is it a wonder that they are bigoted in their hatred of Protestant truth?

"PROTESTANTISM.

"The great wealth of its spiritual and temporal lords constitutes all its power; its basis is earthly, and its support purely material and worldly.

"There is no history that abounds more with injustice, and none that attests more the baseness and perversity of the human heart, when it abandons itself to its evil instincts, than the history of Protestantism in England, compelled by its heroes, founders and saints to recognize a king and queen who might have figured well on the throne of Tiberius and Caligula, and not have broken the horrible uniformity, which, in that epoch, crime was establishing among all the Cæsars.

"Its history is not more sad or less miserable in France, whose disunion its leaders had brought about by the introduction of a multitude of small principedoms, which they might have governed according to their caprice, and which would have reduced France to the state of discord that the religious dissensions in Germany have decidedly done. For there is no doubt that, but for Protestantism, Germany would have attained that unity which constitutes the strength and grandeur of empires, but the establishment of which, the pitiful errors of Luther made forever impossible.

"Protestantism in its simplest expression was a protest against unity. At the beginning it protested only against religious unity, but later, dragged along by its principle, it fatally attacked unity wherever it was found, both in the State and in the Church.

"The clergy and the people, then, saved France from the disgrace and humiliation that the Protestants were preparing for her. The religious orders, above all, shone for their fearlessness and zeal, and the people compelled the king to embrace their faith, thus establishing the honor of the Christian populace, stained by the apostasy of those degenerate nations, who,

like evil flocks following blindly the footsteps of their master, were changing and rechanging their faith according to the caprice of the rulers who controlled it.

"The peoples that have separated themselves from the Church have thrown off her yoke only to submit themselves to the much harder and more humiliating yoke of temporal lords. For after all, the Church apprehends men in the superior part of their being, speaks to their intelligence and commands their will. Its authority is purely spiritual, whether it be considered in the things it commands, in the matters over which it exercises itself, in its nature, or in its forms. Temporal authority, on the contrary, arrests a man in that part of his being which is subject to the conditions of space and time. It does not ask of him more than one thing, viz., to do what it commands, and to abstain from that which it prohibits, leaving him free to think what he likes, both in respect to the authority itself and the standards he accepts or thinks he ought to accept. It does not ask obedience so much as submission, and if any one resist it has the power to compel, or the lash to punish.

"Protestants have transferred to monarchs all the rights and all the authority of which they have robbed the Church. They have not acquired more liberty; they have done nothing but change their yoke; they have not emancipated themselves from the power of the pope as they pretend to believe; instead of having one pope in Rome they have many popes, viz., rulers. Instead of the excommunications of the Church and the flashes from the Vatican, they have the decisions and sentences of secular tribunals, the dungeons and bayonets of temporal lords.

"They have aggravated their yoke, and have degraded obedience, substituting an authority, which, by its nature and origin, is inferior to an authority essentially spiritual. They have proclaimed the reign of violence, and to them the peoples of Europe owe those humiliating doctrines that attribute to sovereigns a power that the Church would never have attributed to her head, and lay upon the people a yoke even more humiliating than hard or heavy, viz., doctrines equally as lamentable to the princes whose pride they have exploited, as to the people whose anger they have provoked.

"Exempting the sovereigns from dependence upon spiritual authority, declaring itself independent of every power that is not of God, imposing, notwithstanding, as a duty upon the people, an unlimited submission, Protestantism has opened the abyss of revolutions, and let loose upon the world the dominion of anarchy. The right of vigilance and censure being separated from the Church, every man has tried to possess himself of it,

All desire to be judges. No one consents to be judged; and for three centuries the history of the European nations fluctuates between despotism and anarchy, between servile submission and proud rebellions, without being able to settle on one side or the other; for scarcely is it inclined to the right, when a violent reaction immediately drives it to the left. In this perpetual vacillation of events, interests and ideas, there is nothing stable; nothing can take root; and we are those that suffer vertigo, who fancy that everything about them is spinning round in rapid and incessant rotation.

"Protestant missions are fruitless, for when not inspired by the interest or the allurements of gain, they are the offsprings of pride or of the spirit of faction. Catholic missions, on the contrary, always produce abundant fruit, because the zeal of its apostles, guided by the true faith, is always accompanied by unbounded charity. Protestant missionaries are very often no more than commercial agents dependent upon a society that pays them, for whose benefit they labor, making use of religion (an awful abuse of holy things!) as an instrument and means of worldly interests. The indifference and apathy of these men contrasts very singularly with the zeal and love of those sublime apostles, who, after giving their time and their life to the peoples they evangelize, very often give them their life's blood besides, in this way perpetuating in the Church that tradition of sacrifice and martyrdom that commenced at Calvary with the passion and death of Jesus Christ our Lord.

"Barrenness, impotence, death, void, nothingness—such is the inheritance of Protestantism that has protested against unity. Without science, indeed, merely with systems diverging in all directions, which it is impossible to convert to a common centre, without art, indeed, with only a dry and fruitless imitation of that which was already existing, and with abhorrence of the beautiful carried even to madness, without constitution, without unity in doctrine, without history, without traditions, the sixteenth century saw Protestants renew the scenes of vandalism which signalized the conquest of the barbarians before the Middle Ages, and destroy the temples, images and everything sacred that Catholic piety had multiplied so marvelously in Europe.

"Protestants have denied the sacrifice of the altar, and in the Eucharist, which is begotten from it, they have seen no more than an ineffective remembrance of the passion of the Redeemer. Sacrifice once abolished, there was no longer need of altars; they therefore overthrew them. The altars destroyed, there was no need of priesthood; they therefore denied it. Sacrifice abolished and the altars overthrown, worship was both useless and impossible; they therefore regarded it as idolatry and did away with it.

"Everywhere faith has disappeared; and, in fact, how is man to be believed in when he no longer desires to believe in God or in the Church, and, indeed, only in himself? Trust has abandoned all souls; universal distrust holds all men in perpetual restlessness. The son no longer believes in his father, nor brother in brother, nor husband in wife, nor friend in friend; the people no longer believe in the kings, nor the kings in the people. Selfishness devours society, and threatens to destroy it to its very foundations; no one loves anything but his own person, his well-being, and that which may be given to him, or enrich him. The insatiable thirst for gold agitates all souls, and drains to the source the noblest sentiments and purest affections. Behold, where Protestantism applied to history and to society has brought us! It commenced by protesting against the Church; to-day it protests against everything except itself. It began by overthrowing religious society; to-day the axe cleaves the society of the family, the constitution of which it endeavors to destroy by means of divorce or a baseness that would liken man to the brute."

THE DUTY OF PROTESTANTS

BY THE REV. F. H. HORTON, D.D.

(Concluded.)

3. Truth is the first weapon in the warfare of Protestantism. One of the liberating spirits of the nineteenth century in England was Matthew Arnold, and a verse of his might well be inscribed on our banners; for it tells the secret of our English life and training, and affords the guarantee for that renewed warfare against Rome which we thought had been accomplished by our fathers in the sixteenth century:

"For rigorous teachers trained my youth,
And fed its lamp, and trimmed its fire;
Showed me the high white star of truth,
There bade me gaze, and there aspire."

We cannot lay too much stress on this. If Romanism is Christianity, if this system is the intention of Christ, if this practical repudiation of the New Testament, the teaching of our Lord and of His apostles, has any justification, in theoretic truth or in practical results, let us be eager to accept it. Let us have an open mind. The Bible is before us, history is before us, the work of Catholicism is before us. We have no interest to misrepresent the doctrine or the practise of the Roman

Church. If we are misinformed, we are ready to retract; if we are ignorant, we want to know. But if the infallible pope said at the Vatican Council that he "**wished of course that Catholicism should have the benefit of toleration in England and Russia, but the principle must be repudiated by a Church holding the doctrine of exclusive salvation,**"¹ we ought to know; England ought to know it. The Roman Church is in favor of intolerance.

For my own part, I take my stand wholly on what Rome herself teaches and does. I lay no stress on her abuses or her failures. All Churches have their faults. But it is her avowed doctrine, her closely organized system, and her admitted mode of working it, facts, indisputable facts, which are sufficient, if known, to save England from yielding to her blandishments.

No instructed Catholic can deny (1) that his Church repudiates the principle of toleration; (2) that his Church places the pope in a position which requires the absolute and unqualified surrender of the mind and even of the conscience to his authority; (3) that St. Alfonso de Liguori, a Doctor of the Church, whose writings were declared by the pope to be free from error, taught that the priest is the creator of his Creator, and that the soul can get to Heaven by Mary more readily than it can by Christ.²

If the pope could publicly deny these things, if Catholics were entitled to deny them, it would be quite different. They do not; they cannot. Their only weapon of evasion is to leave these things in silence and to fix on some trifling error of language or quotation, and to suggest that one who states these facts is untrustworthy.

It is the Catholic method of controversy which, when it is understood, is the most damning evidence against the Roman

1. Acton. "History of Freedom," p. 520.

2. See "Glories of Mary," p. 248. "O immaculate and entirely pure Virgin Mary, Mother of God, Queen of the universe . . . through thee we have been reconciled with our God." "Thou art the consolation of the world . . . the salvation of the whole world . . . O immaculate Virgin, we are under thy protection, and therefore we have recourse to thee alone; and we beseech thee to prevent thy beloved Son, who is irritated by our sin, from abandoning us to the power of the devil." Or again, on pp. 251, 252: "O Mary, thou art omnipotent to save sinners. . . . We are all God's debtors, but He is a debtor to thee." If any Catholic in authority would or could repudiate the appalling extravagances of St. Alfonso de Liguori, we should have hope of reformation. But no, every good Catholic is absolutely bound to the teaching of this Doctor and canonised saint of the Church.

Church. She knows that what she calls "truth" is no longer true to the enlightened mind, and must be repudiated by all who love truth for truth's sake. She is engaged in an endless effort to divert men's minds from the subject of truth and to force them into submission to authority. But just in proportion as we see the "high white star of truth" we repudiate that Church which has dimmed it, and, so far as possible, hidden it.

But while this is the general principle of our resistance to Rome, a demand for truth and a belief in truth, practical questions emerge: Ought we to maintain the oath which the sovereign is bound to take at the coronation? Ought we to insist on the inspection of convents? Ought we to allow public money to go to the maintenance of Catholic schools?

When Protestants are called to action to-day it is on these issues that the appeal turns; and we cannot be too careful in discriminating. It injures our cause if in the defense of it we are tempted to advocate anything which violates our own principles of liberty and justice.

There is the question of the coronation oath. It was once a vital matter to exclude a Catholic King. Charles II. and James II. were our last Catholic kings. The one reduced the moral tone of this country to the lowest point it has ever reached; the other brought our liberties and our Constitution to the verge of ruin, and we were saved only by the glorious revolution of 1688. When the last Catholic king was driven with ignominy from our shores, and the "Pretenders" were finally vanquished at Preston Pans and Culloden, this country registered its silent vow: "Never again!" And no Catholic, oath or not, could ever sit on the English throne. He would be so entirely out of harmony with the country that the Throne, which maintains its position and authority solely by the goodwill of the people, would be overthrown. If the King became a Catholic, the heart of his people would necessarily turn from him. It is by a far surer and more radical method that the King is kept Protestant than by the oath. For, indeed, the oath is no hindrance to a Catholic, as the later Stuarts showed. If the sovereign were a Catholic, he would get a dispensation from the pope to take the oath, which re-

pudiates Catholicism. The oath, therefore, is no security, and little is gained by preserving an antiquated and unreal safeguard. Or if, while the establishment of a Church continues in this country, it is necessary to secure by a formal enactment that the sovereign is a Protestant, the oath can, at any rate, be modified in its terms, so that the language which is unnecessarily offensive may not wound the Catholic subjects of the Crown. If the oath itself is an antiquated and useless defense, still more is the language in which it is couched an unnecessary and mischievous irritation.

To countervail Romanism the best, and only, method is to give Roman Catholics absolute equality with Protestants, to remove all disabilities, and apply the uniform principles of liberty and justice. The country quickly finds that Catholics disqualify themselves for the higher and the more important posts. If we ever had one Catholic Chancellor, there would be little fear of having another. The Catholic training and the Catholic principles, the complete subjection of the Catholic mind to priest and pope, make it impossible for a Catholic to hold the highest place in the judiciary of a free people. He would bring the whole system of law into suspicion. No judge can be impartial whose conscience and intellect are in the keeping of an alien authority.

The security for Protestantism in the high offices of the State is intrinsic rather than statutory. We can, if our principles are right, fearlessly trust that security. We have only to remember that every genuine Catholic firmly believes that the Government of the land ought to suppress heresy, and that the canon law overrides civil law, to see that "good Catholics" cannot be trusted in the high places of the State.

Of course, if the country became Catholic, the King, the Lord Chancellor, and the judges might safely be Catholic, as they are in Spain or Belgium; but that is a situation which need not be discussed, for England would have ceased to be England.

The inspection of convents is quite different. There is no injustice, and no unworthy interference with liberty, if the country demands the inspection of these, as of other institu-

tions. The demand of the Roman Church for exemption from the control and securities which a wise Government offers may be granted as a favor, but cannot be conceded as a right.

If laundries and industrial schools are inspected, in order to avoid the abuses and cruelties which easily spring up in such institutions, there is no reason why these institutions should not be inspected when they are connected with convents. And, with the enormous increase of convents in this country, especially when many of them are those French communities which fled from their own country in order to elude the salutary inspection of the Government, it would be wise and perfectly just to insist on such inspections here. But it is to be remembered that the inspection is entirely in the interests of the institutions themselves; and if they decline the guarantee which such inspection gives, they must take the consequences. Give them time, and conventual institutions always perish by their own intrinsic corruptions. An unnatural and demoralizing system brings its own Nemesis. Catholic countries, like Italy and France, are always driven, in the long run, to suppress the convents as a national danger. But a free people under Protestant rule can afford to let them alone until their inevitable day of doom comes. If Catholics choose to enter into that useless and futile life which has been sufficiently revealed to the world by the writings of Joseph McCabe, or by the narrative of Miss Moulton, who escaped from the convent at Bergholt, they should be allowed to do so. After all, it is fortunate in a way that Catholicism borrowed the monastic ideal from Buddhism; it is one of the main reasons of its sterilization and ultimate ruin.

Before Protestantism became a living power, Catholic countries were bound to suppress monasteries and convents in order to escape a threatened death; but when the world is practically Protestant, and the life of the country is secured by the principles of liberty and truth, it need not interfere with those deluded people who, in ignorance of the redemptive work of Christian faith, seek a refuge from the world in the cloister.

We should, therefore, probably be wise if we limited our

demand for convent inspection to the perfectly reasonable requirement that industrial and educational institutions must submit to inspection, whether they be in connection with convents or not.

The question of Catholic education raises a more difficult and complicated problem. There is no doubt that if the Catholics became a powerful body, and threaten in any way to master the community, we must defend ourselves from the influence of the priests in the schools. The ruin of Ireland has been justly traced by Mr. Hugh O'Donnell to the priestly domination of the Irish schools. And Father Crowley's book, "The Parochial School a Curse to the Church, a Menace to the Nation," shows how mischievous the Catholic schools are even in America. No free country could maintain its freedom, or even its intelligence, if the schools and universities were left in the hands of Rome. Probably nine out of ten Englishmen are aware of this; and the country would be justified in insisting on secular education if there were even a fear of priestly domination in the schools.

But it may be fairly urged that the Catholics are a very small section of our English people. Of the 2,000,000 Catholics in this country, 1,800,000 are Irish or foreigners; only 200,000 are genuinely English. These Catholics, like the Jews, pay rates. Considering the necessity of Catholic education for the support of Catholicism, a great and generous country may justly consent to the principle that Catholics may pay their rates to the Catholic schools. The more complete we can make our system of public schools, with the common religious teaching and atmosphere which meet the needs of all Protestants, the more safely we may grant to sections, like Catholics and Jews, schools of their own. Inevitably the public schools will draw away from, and supersede, the sectarian institutions. Enlightened Catholics will, in their children's interest, prefer the public schools, as they do in America. We need not therefore make the education question the first line of our defense against Rome. Leave Rome to educate her own children, and you only hasten her decay. History, science, literature, taught with a Roman bias, put the children and the youths at a hope-

less disadvantage in competition with the scholars of free and enlightened schools. Light is the great boon; Rome perishes because she loves darkness rather than light.

What, then, is the method for resisting Rome, beyond the bold statement of the facts, and speaking the truth in the love of it? If we are not to depend on the methods which savor of political disqualification or political repression, if we are to give the Catholics advantages and liberty such as they would never dream of giving to us when they have the power, on what can we rely in the struggle for freedom from the Roman domination?

On what did our fathers rely when they were called upon to oppose Rome with her as yet unbroken prestige and power? For a thousand years she had ruled with all the appearance of Heaven-given authority; her organization, absolute and crushing, was ubiquitous; she had kings and governments as her obedient tools; she had prisons and thumbscrews, racks and faggots at her disposal. But our fathers overthrew her by the simple power of the gospel of Christ, by the truth as it is in Jesus, by the co-operation of the Holy Spirit. The weapons of our warfare are spiritual and mighty to the pulling down of strongholds. Rome professes to laugh them to scorn, but she knows they are irresistible. To-day, of the 500,000,000 of Christendom, only 180,000,000 are in the Roman obedience; and the vast majority of these are illiterate. The truth has won, and is winning. Surely, if slowly, by the laws of God which are always operant, Catholicism is breaking up, and Christianity is coming. Truth, light, liberty, these are the solvents of that dark and hoary system.

But our surest way of taking our part in the victory of light is to enter into the living experience of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Directly we come to him, and are pardoned and reconciled to God by His work, we receive the Holy Spirit, witnessing with our spirit that we are the children of God. We stand fast in the liberty with which Christ has made us free. Straightway the Bible becomes to us a light and a power. We have within reach our authority and our criterium. The Spiritual life which comes to us in this faith and

experience enables us to resist the Roman error and despotism with the power of God. The Reformers were irresistible by virtue of this power; we by the same means can be irresistible, too.

We must grasp our real weapons; we must occupy our proper strategic positions. God is with us, Christ is our captain, within us works the Holy Spirit, that brought cosmos out of chaos and light out of darkness. No one who has once looked into the law of liberty, and understood the forces which came in Jesus Christ to redeem and regenerate mankind, can have any doubt that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. And with this certainty our way becomes plain, and all doubt and misgiving vanish. It is the gospel which shatters the Roman system as it shattered the heathenism of which the Roman Church is so close an imitation. The tradition perishes before an open Bible. The Virgin and the saints recede before the living Christ. Priests and popes are superseded by the Church, which is itself a kingdom of priests.

Finally, let us not be dismayed because Rome, perishing all over the world, finds a temporary shelter and an apparent success in these Protestant countries, where her methods and principles are unknown. If England in her mighty youth was able to resist and to repudiate the pope, we may be sure that in her maturity she will not succumb. If the cycles of the past should be repeated, if another Bloody Mary should seize the throne, and light the fires of Smithfield, the spirit of England would find another Elizabeth, another Cromwell. What we have been we yet shall be. If our fathers rejected Rome on account of its practical corruption and oppression, we are not likely to submit to it when we understand how those corruptions and oppressions are inherent in the system, when we behold with open and purged eyes the theoretical errors and the dogmatic fictions which lead inevitably to these practical results.*

* These articles and the articles published in "The Converted Catholic" in the issues of last November and December, entitled "Why Romanism Ruins a Country" by the same author, together with other papers from the pens of Dr. Horton and Mr. Joseph Hocking, are published in book form under the title, "Shall Rome Reconquer England." The book is published in England, and we shall be happy to procure copies for any of our readers who may desire them. We shall publish the price of the book next month.

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

XVI.

My dear Cardinal:

The more I seek, for brevity's sake, to eliminate from our discussion all those popes whose election presents no grave reasons for doubt as to its being canonical, the more difficult it is to find any such. It is not my fault, but the fault of the accusers of poor Boniface VI., who, because he was killed fourteen days after his election, had not time to be a very bad pope, although by nature, or for the sake of following the customs of his predecessors, he might have been one, had he lived.

Our last letter brought us up to St. Felix II., successor of Liberius.

Were it not that we know your Church to be arbitrary and captious to the last degree, it would be impossible to explain why he remains in the catalogue of popes, saints and martyrs. Let us quote from "Lives of Popes," pp. 80, 81:

"In two ordinations Liberius created nineteen bishops, eighteen priests and five deacons." This author, who knows so much, ought to tell us at what epoch Liberius conferred these orders, for it is very important to know whether it was before his exile when his integrity and constancy inspire our respect, or after his exile, when he returned to take possession of the Holy See at the expense of the faith. "He governed the Church" we are told, "fourteen years, four months and two days, and died on the 9th of December, A. D. 366. Though we have quite correctly given above the date of 366, it will be noticed that in the next chapter we go back to the date of the year 359, the date of the accession of Felix, who probably had some intermediate authority during the troubles of Liberius." Here the author maliciously, or with a "good purpose," hides the truth, a practise which is very common among your historians, for the benefit of the ignorant. "*In the next chapter*" he affirms that Felix ascended the papal throne in 359, and reckons his pontificate from this date on to 366, the same year in which he has already told us occurred the death of Liberius. If, then, St. Felix was already made pope during the life of Liberius (359), why are we told that

upon the death of Liberius "the holy see was *vacant for ten days?*" Ought not the author rather to have said: "When Liberius died, the Church, zealous for the apostolic succession, had already enthroned another pope seven years previously"?

But let us see what explanation is given. On p. 81, "Lives of Popes" says: "Authors differ as to the exact circumstances under which Felix thus acted. Did he act as the absent pope's vicar? Did he usurp authority? Or was he, with the absent pope's consent, actually, though privately and temporarily, elected pope, with the understanding that on the return of Liberius, should that ever take place, Felix would retire? Be that as it may, it is certain that when Liberius did return, Felix laid down his authority and went to practise the Christian virtues in retirement." The coolness of this author's deliberate misrepresentation is amazing! We know of no author, deserving credence, who has attempted to explain "the exact circumstances under which Felix thus acted." The great problem has always been, "Why was Felix ever put on the list of popes?" The author's question: "Did he act as the absent pope's vicar?" is too absurd. In the first place, if Pius X. has canceled Boniface VI. because there exists no record of his investiture, having died fourteen days after his election, it is to be supposed that in the Vatican there must exist the records of all the other popes, and, therefore, that of St. Felix among them, in which record it must be plainly stated whether he was invested as pope or as vicar of the absent pope. In the second place, when has the author or any one else ever seen that a man could be elected vicar and without further ceremony become pope? By avoiding the truth the author makes himself ridiculous. But his audacity reaches its climax when he says: "Be that as it may, it is certain that when Liberius did return Felix laid down his authority and went to practise the Christian virtues in retirement." The author knows that this is not true. Every student of history knows that when the emperor permitted the return of Liberius it was with the command that he govern the Church in connection with Felix. Your best historians agree that the martyrdoms of that time were nothing but the result of the quarrels between the two factions, the party of Liberius and the party of Felix.

In proof of this we cite the modern version of some of your own authors, who say that "the ladies of Rome instigated the people to demand of the emperor that Liberius should be brought back from exile, and the emperor called him back on condition that he should govern in peace *with* Felix." From this it is easy to see that there existed in Rome a faction contrary to Felix and loyal to Liberius, but that Felix had the favor of the emperor, who was a personal enemy of the exiled pope, therefore, upon the return of Liberius, there existed two parties, and strife was inevitable. That Liberius' party triumphed is evident from the fact that the emperor decreed the exile of Felix in order to prevent "quarrels and bloody combats." Felix several times attempted to return and take possession of the papal power. Let us quote one of your authorities, Du Pin: "Felix, whose faction was not destroyed, returned soon after to the city, daring to call the people together in a church beyond the Tiber, but the nobility forced him to quit Rome a second time. Felix retired to a small estate, which he owned, where he lived nearly eight years." It is plain to be seen that Felix never left his position until he lost favor with the emperor.

Why this lack of frankness? The facts of the case, admitted by all Roman historians who have any self-respect, are the following, taken from St. Athanasius:

Liberius courageously refused to accept Arianism, and he thereby made himself odious to this sect, which, because it had become so influential, attracted the favor of the emperor. The Arian party tried by means of the emperor to oblige the pope to excommunicate St. Athanasius and approve Arianism, which Liberius refused to do. The emperor then banished Liberius. The Arians wished to place another bishop in the see of Rome, and it is evident that the emperor, having banished Liberius because he had refused to embrace Arianism, was not going to put in his place any one who was not in sympathy with this sect. The Emperor Constantius, with Epitectus, whom he had created Bishop of Centumcella, now Civita Vecchia, as his tool, caused the Deacon Felix to be consecrated bishop, and placed him on the papal throne. St. Jerome assures us that Agapus took part in this consecration, and that Felix was an Arian. Only Theo-

doret and Ruffinus say that Felix was not an Arian in doctrine, but was associated with that party in everything else. There is no ground for this affirmation. If Felix had been a friend of the true pope, Liberius, he never would have accepted the consecration at the hands of heretics, who had caused the pope's exile, and much less would he have been willing to occupy his place. And if Liberius was banished for not accepting Arianism, is it not reasonable to believe that his successor would have had the same fate if he had not changed his doctrine? Du Pin says: "All the ancients agree that the ordination was unlawful and void; and some late authors are very much to be blamed for putting this man in the catalogue of popes, and yet they have far less reason to place him among the holy martyrs in very many martyrologies." (Du Pin, Vol. I., p. 190. Ed. 1723). If we are to believe St. Athanasius, the reason is plain why the ancients wisely hold this election as uncanonical. In his epistle to those who lead a monastic life he says: "Felix was consecrated in the Imperial Palace (although it should have taken place in the church) without the consent of the people, or the election of the clergy, by Epitectus in the presence of the Emperor and three eunuchs and three bishops, who were rather spies than bishops. The faithful would not permit him to enter into the church, and withdrew themselves from his communion."

How Gregory the Great could place Felix in the catalogue of saints and martyrs no one is able to explain, as there is no ancient document to authorize it. St. Jerome calls him anti-pope; Optatus and St. Augustine make no mention of him, but put Damasus after Liberius. But the reason which the Church to-day gives for venerating him as pope and martyr is most amusing. The incident is recounted by Baronius, and it is referred to in "Lives of Popes," p. 81: "In the year 1382, while they were laboring, by order of the pope, on the reformation of the Roman martyrology, they were deliberating if they should give to Felix the title of martyr, or strike him from the catalogue of saints. Baronius composed a long dissertation in order to show that Felix was neither saint nor martyr. He was applauded by all judicious men, and the fathers affirmed that he had been inserted by accident into the sacred catalogue. The Cardinal Santorius undertook the defense of Felix, but met with

no success. This religious discussion led some priests to dig secretly under the altar of the church of St. Cosmus and St. Damian, where they discovered a great marble sepulchre, in which were enclosed, on one side, the relics of the holy martyrs, Mark, Marcellinus and Tranquillin, and on the other side a coffin, with this inscription: "The body of St. Felix, pope and martyr, who condemned Constantius."

This discovery having been made on the eve of his fête day when he was on the point of losing his cause, they attributed to a miracle. The same Baronius regarded himself so blessed at finding himself defeated by a saint, that he retracted at once all that he had written. But to-day every one knows that this inscription was not genuine, and in spite of the dissertation of Cardinal Belarmino in defense of Felix, Natalis, Alexander, Sangallo, Fleury and Lupus deny that he ever was pope, saint or martyr, and look upon him as an anti-pope and a heretic. "Lives of Popes" assures us (p. 81) that St. Felix "in a single ordination created nineteen bishops, twenty-seven priests and five deacons." In case of his being anti-pope none of these ordinations were canonical. Therefore, Damasus, Siricius, Anastasius and St. Innocent I., whom many authors admit to have been ordained by Felix, were not canonically ordained, and could not transmit the all-important apostolic succession.

Apostolic succession is like a chain, which, if one little link is missing, loses all its strength. But alas! for the claims of a direct and unbroken line coming down from St. Peter to the present pope. How many breaks, how many flaws in this chain! What a poor, pitiful line for a drowning man to cling to! Every link is false and ready to give way at a touch.

Cardinal, instead of counseling the souls under your care to cling to this poor, worthless chain, tell them to lay hold of the hand of Jesus, extended to them as He walks upon life's troubled sea, even as Peter, when he felt himself sinking, laid hold of it and was saved.

Lest I be accused of partiality I must not pass over St. Damasus, successor of St. Felix II. (or of St. Liberius, which?) I say, lest I be accused of partiality to a fellow country-man, for he, as well as I, had the glory of being born in Spain, that

land of fragrant flowers and romantic loves, but a land of the good and the bad, as is the case everywhere.

But I must confess that I never have felt proud of having St. Damasus for a fellow country-man. I remember one day an innocent little "padre" said to me: "If it were not for St. Damasus we Spaniards would be badly represented in the papacy!" I, who at that time had some experience and knowledge of the history of the papacy, thought to myself that we might willingly dispense with such a representative. But we must admit it to be true of Damasus, as it is of all Spaniards who have figured at the papal court, that Rome made them what they were. It is a curious historical fact that all Spaniards who have become famous as philosophers or prelates in Rome left their native land in childhood and received their education in the Eternal City. They, more than any others, have proved the saying: "*Roma veduta, fede perduta*" (Rome seen means faith lost). Among them all the only exception I make is Cardinal Vives, who lost every shred of his faith before he went to Rome; but he, too, left Spain very young to go to Central and North America, then to France, and finally to the Vatican.

But to return to St. Damasus: I will not discuss here the accusation of Isaac the Jew, nor the law of *Talion*, which he established for the punishment of those who did not think as he did, an anticipation of Torquemada, nor other things of which we hope to write when we treat of popes who were "not very respectable." Our present object is to see if his election was canonical. In "Lives of Popes" we read that "Sent to Rome at an early age, he at first was a writer and reader, then deacon, and at length *cardinal-priest*." This authority informs us that he was ordained deacon by Liberius, and naively adds: "It has been affirmed that during the exile of Liberius, Damasus was his vicar" (p. 83). But we are not told where or by whom this has been "affirmed," so it is impossible to investigate the truth of it. What has been affirmed by no less an authority than the Jesuit, Father Zaccaria, is that "*Damasus did not follow Liberius into exile, but only feigned to do so, and then hastened back to Rome and usurped the pontifical authority.*" This affirmation Artaud denies ("Lives of Popes," p. 83), solely because it is

found "in the preface of the memorial of Faustinus and Marcellinus, and the author was schismatical." But aside from the fact that the "schism" of the author consists in his having more love for the truth than for the pope, Father Zaccaria, who made this statement in the *preface*, being a Jesuit, of course, cannot be accused of being either mistaken or schismatical. Where, in the whole history of the company of Jesus, has Artaud seen that any of its members were ever *schismatical, untruthful or plagiarists?*

However, it is clear why the author of "Lives of Popes" cannot admit the truth of such a statement after having already said that Felix acted as the absent pope's vicar. Indeed, how could it be possible that there should have been three popes at the same time—one in exile and two his vicars, or one his vicar and one a usurper, and all three *saints!* That is too big a mouthful for even a Roman historian to swallow, and the question has given them all so much difficulty that they have been obliged to give it up as impossible. Artaud dismisses it very easily by saying with lofty disdain (p. 83): "We need give no credence to what this opponent says against Damasus."

That Damasus did not find the road to the papacy a very smooth one all historians agree, and not a few have doubted whether his election was free or enforced by the emperor. Let us see what a friend of Damasus says (Du Pin, Vol. I, p. 226, Ed. 1723): "After the death of Pope Liberius, which happened in the year 369 ("Lives of Popes" says 366) the See of Rome being vacant for some time ("Lives of Popes" says *ten days*), by reason of the caballing of those that pretended to fill it, Damasus at last was chosen by the greater part of the clergy and people and ordained by the bishops. But on the other side, Ursinus, or Ursicinus, who was his competitor for the popedom, got himself ordained by some other bishops in the church of Sicinius. This contest caused a great division in the City of Rome, and stirred up so great a sedition there as could hardly be appeased. The two parties came from words to blows, and a great many Christians were killed in the churches of Rome upon this quarrel. The Governor of Rome, called Pretextatus, being desirous to allay the heat of this contention sent Ursicinus

into banishment by the emperor's order; but his banishment did not perfectly appease the quarrel, for the partisans of Ursicinus assembled still in the churches of which they were possessed, without ever communicating with Damasus; and even when the emperor had ordered that their churches should be taken from them they still kept up their assemblies without the city, so that it was necessary at last to drive them quite out of Rome. And yet all this did not hinder Ursicinus from having his secret associates in Italy and at Rome. The Bishop of Puteoli, called Florentius, and the Bishop of Parma, were most zealous for his interest."

But in "Church and Saints," so highly recommended by you, evidently with the object of allaying the doubts which this election arouses, but without any authority for so doing, the elections of Damasus and Ursicinus are separated. In the chapter for the 11th of December, the feast of St. Damasus (pp. 314, 315) we read: The father of St. Damasus, either after his wife's death or with her consent (which?) had entered the priesthood and served the parish church of St. Lawrence in Rome. His son, Damasus, also entered the sacred ministry, being attached to the same church. Under Pope Liberius (or Felix, which?) he obtained a great share in the government of the Church, and when Liberius died in 366, Damasus, then sixty years old, was elected to succeed him. *Shortly after his election* an unfortunate and disgraceful affair occurred, in which a number of persons lost their life. An anti-pope had usurped the title of Bishop of Rome, and some of his followers were in the Liberian Basilica. *The adherents of Pope Damasus* endeavored to deliver them over to the hands of the law, and this was the occasion of the combat."

De Cormenin (Vol. I., pp. 62, 63,) puts quite another aspect on the matter: "Damasus was a Spaniard by birth and the son of a writer named Anthony, who established himself at Rome as a scribe. The young Damasus, having been educated with great care in the study of polite literature, entered into orders and followed Pope Liberius when exiled to Berea, a city of Thrace. He returned afterward to Rome and abandoned his protector to join the party of Felix.

"After the death of Liberius, the factions which divided the clergy excited a violent sedition in giving him a successor. Each party assembled separately. Damasus, who was sixty years old, was chosen and ordained in the church of Lucina, while Ursin was proclaimed in another church. When it came to taking possession of the papal see the two competitors sharply disputed the throne, and the people, taking part in the schism, a serious revolt ensued. Juventius, prefect of Rome, and Julian, prefect of provisions, exiled Ursin as well as the deacons, Amantius and Loup, the principal leaders. They then arrested seven seditious priests, whom they wished to banish from the city. But the party of Ursin rescued them from the hands of the officers and conducted them in triumph to the Church of Julius. The partisans of Damasus, armed with swords and clubs, *with the pontiff at their head*, reassembled in order to drive them off. They besieged the church, and the gates being forced, they murdered women, children and old men, and the massacre was terminated by incendiarism. The next day there were found under the ruins the dead bodies of one hundred and thirty-seven persons, who had been killed by arms or strangled in the flames."

How sad, my dear Cardinal, that the throne of St. Peter should have been stained so deeply by crime, and that it should have been so often impossible to ascend it except by building a stairway of corpses!

From all that we have written, to which we could add innumerable quotations from your best historians, one must become convinced that the best way *never* to know the truth is to study diligently the pages of your Church's history. At least, I have found this to be so in my own experience. When I was a very young man, I believed myself to be well informed in history. I was very fond of it, and my favorite study was the lives of the saints and the persecutions of the Church. As I grew older and dedicated myself to a more profound study of these subjects I found that instead of acquiring additional knowledge I was constantly losing what I had already learned. The histories I had read were contradicted by those I then was reading, and the "*facts*" with which I had stored my mind became displaced and fell away from me as the dry leaves fall from the trees in

Autumn. As the fruit of all my studies, I came to this conviction: that the Church had filled my young mind with lies, and that however diligently I studied her authors I should never come to a knowledge of the truth. I had exceptional advantages for this study, which I here acknowledge with sentiments of gratitude. I studied history with the monks, who are the best masters of everything which may be called "fraud."

Upon the authority of the authors above quoted, who cannot be condemned by any good Catholic until the Church, *Mistress of Truth*, condemns them, we might either believe that Damasus, obedient from childhood, went to Rome because he was "sent" by his parents, or that he was in Rome because his father, a priest, married and lived there. It is equally uncertain whether his mother had died, or whether, renouncing her rights, she had given up her husband to the Church. The qualities of famous scribe and *literato*, which "Church and Saints" attributes to the father, are so similar to those which "Lives of Popes" attributes to the son, that it is possible that in the lapse of time the two may have been confounded, and the story of the wife, alive or dead, may have reference to Damasus himself. This, although we cannot say that it is at all extraordinary, does not sound well for a pope. Some historians have treated of this question, which to-day seems to me to be so unimportant. At one time, I confess, it quite preoccupied me; so much so that I consulted an old "father" about it. "Don't be a fool," he answered; "don't bother your head about that; your investigation cannot benefit humanity, any way, for if we could prove to the pope that one of his predecessors was married, all he would do would be to at once canonize the wife for being such a saint as to give up her husband to the service of the Church, and poor humanity would pay for the knowledge of this fact by having imposed upon it a new idolatry."

But though the question whether Damasus was a married man or not has little to do with our present discussion, we must not pass over Artaud's audacity in asserting that "*at length* he was made *cardinal-priest*." Here the author, out of his extreme devotion to the Church, falls into a great error. Among the obscure things of the Church, and she has many, is the origin

of the cardinalate. That party which is interested in making it appear that the Church does not change (which is more difficult to prove than that the sun does not give forth heat) by the aid of documents which were claimed to be as ancient as the credulity of human ignorance would warrant, has tried to prove that the institution of the College of Cardinals is of very great antiquity, and they have presented ridiculous theories. Our author here forgets that on p. 32 he gives us a quotation from Novaes (Introduc., Vol I., 29), in which he says: "In the eleventh century, under the reign of Nicholas II., the elective faculty was limited to the principal priests and vicarial bishops of Rome, who were then generally called metropolitan cardinals, cardinal-bishops, etc." The fact that they were "generally called cardinals," if it is true, which remains to be proven, would indicate that there did not exist any definitely created "college," but that this was only a manner of distinguishing certain ecclesiastics, just as at first the title of "pope" was given to all ecclesiastics, afterward was restricted to the bishops, and finally was appropriated for his sole use by the Bishop of Rome. Alzog himself (Vol. II., p. 344,) says: "The title of cardinal was first applied in the eleventh century to the bishops immediately around Rome (episcopi collaterales papæ) who were in a sense of the pope's diocese."

The seventh letter of Pope Siricius, so much used in this connection, proves nothing, except the fact that the pope did not exercise his own absolute authority. Providing that letter is genuine, all it says is, that in his condemnation of Jovinian and his allies, "he gave the judgment by the advice of the Roman clergy, *facto presbyterio*," which is as much as to say, *assembled in council*.

The partisans of the antiquity of the cardinalate, who, as we have seen do not trace it back with Artaud's audacity to the fourth century, but only to the reign of Nicholas II., 1059, have never been able to reply to this question of their opponents: "Why, if the College of Cardinals was already created, did Pope Pius V., in 1567, forbid all the clergy, except those created by the pope, to assume the title of cardinal?"

But this is not the only error which, in his zeal, Artaud has

committed in this statement. The more serious matter is that the Church in these days has no interest in demonstrating that Damasus was a cardinal-priest, but on the contrary, tries to prove that he was nothing but a deacon. The reason for this is that the fact of his being ordained deacon by Liberius appears to be well authenticated; and if it is proved that upon his election to the papacy he received the orders of presbyter and bishop also, there would be no doubt of his validity. This is why authors of greater astuteness than Artaud declare that Damasus was ordained by three bishops, and that Ursicinus was ordained by only one, and he a schismatic. *Ordained* in those times could be taken to mean ordained *in sacris*, or consecrated bishop. But if it can be proved that Damasus was really, as Artaud claims, a *priest* (whether cardinal or not) then there is no doubt that he received his priestly orders from Felix, called by many of your best authorities anti-pope and heretic.

So, Cardinal, it remains for you to tell us whether Artaud speaks the truth when he says that Damasus was a cardinal-priest or not. If he tells the truth, then you should send a recommendation to the pope asking him to strike out Damasus from the list; and if he does not tell the truth you should suppress Artaud. But this would put you in a bad predicament; for, is there any trustworthy and impartial historian you could recommend for the faithful to read instead?

However, we will leave St. Damasus to our readers to form whatever opinion they please of him, and will go on to Siricius, his successor; and, on reaching this point, I cannot suppress a sigh of relief!

Your historians, as I have already reminded you in a former letter, have been obliged to admit that the writings attributed to the early popes are fraudulent, but they assure us that with Siricius begins "authentic history." This being so, you may well understand how great has been my desire to leave behind the darkness of the first centuries, and to come out into the light of the historic age.

We shall enter into no details here with regard to Siricius, St. Anastasius, St. Innocent or St. Zocimus, not because we have not the same doubts with regard to their pontificates, but precisely because the Church herself has never been able to prove

their orders to have been canonical. It is said that all of them were of Damasus' creation; but aside from the fact that Damasus' own canonical legitimacy is questioned, as we have pointed out, the positions which some of these men occupied in the Church before Damasus became pope are sufficient basis to make several of your own historians agree that the most important matter here is for the Church to prove their orders to have been canonical. When the Church is able to do this we may be able *at this point* (I take up each "break" separately, you see, as if it were the only one,) to repair the broken chain of apostolic succession. Meanwhile, to be just, we must say that it remains *broken*. As many reasons have some for denying that these popes were canonically ordained as the opposite party can present for affirming it. All of which proves, Cardinal, that neither you nor any of your Church's hierarchy has the right to condemn any man for not believing in this succession.

We thank God that, unknown and unrecognized by Rome, there has been a true and unbroken chain of apostolic succession even to this day. Those who have formed its firmly welded links have not always exercised ecclesiastical power in the Church, but every one has been filled with God's Spirit and the power and wisdom from on high. And so down through the ages in spite of the blight of Rome, the teachings of Jesus and His apostles still work in the hearts of men, and will work until the pope is dethroned from his presumptuous place upon the altar of God, and He comes, whose right it is to reign.

MANUEL FERRANDO.

Should ex-President Taft be a Unitarian, a Romanist, or a Christian?

The "Pittsburg Observer" (Romanist), of May 29th, remarks as follows: "Ex-President Taft's reasons for being a Unitarian are characteristically cloudy. In a speech at Boston a few days ago he made this declaration: 'I am a Unitarian because my grandfather and my father and my mother were Unitarians.' If he went back far enough along this line of argument he would find that he ought to be a Catholic."

Perhaps! And if he went back still further he might find that he ought to be a Christian.

W. R. C.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION IN ROMAN CATHOLIC EUROPE

During the last few days a series of startling events has conspired to recall public attention to the religious position of the Roman Catholic countries of the Continent. The critical illness of the pope and the evident anxiety it has caused in many directions has shown that, despite the enormous decay of the papal power, the personality of the head of the Roman Church is still an influential factor in the public life of Europe, if not to some extent of the whole world. The internal history of the Roman Catholic Church has been affected by the policy of Pius X., to an extent that only future historians, looking at the story of his reign in proper perspective, will be able to estimate aright. We read from time to time of his bulls and decrees, and can see in part the way in which they have shaped the policy and life of those who look up to him for guidance; but the larger effects, much larger than we can estimate to-day, can only be weighed correctly after a considerable interval. It is an influence in two directions, bondage and liberty. He has riveted the chains of spiritual slavery more firmly on the limbs of those of his followers who have frankly and loyally accepted the position in which their creed places them. Pius has tried to build up one window after another through which the light might reach them in their prison-house. But in so doing he has created a reaction in favor of liberty in the souls of many who have been touched by that Spirit who brings liberty to the souls He enters, and also of those who may be unconscious of that higher influence, but crave a freedom they cannot find where Pius has held sway. That the number of both these classes is very large cannot be doubted, as it is only the more courageous or prominent of them that have attracted public attention. Large numbers have quietly taken their freedom without drawing the eye of the world upon themselves. Those who are familiar with the Modernist literature of the Continent know that speculations have been indulged in as to the character and policy of the immediate successors of the present occupant of the papal see, one of the most interesting of which is Palmarini's interesting

novel, "Quando non Moremmi," in which he gives us his dream of a liberal pope some thirty years hence, and of the startling revolutions his liberal policy would produce. The want of clear insight into the real nature of the religious problem in so able a man is one of the surprising features of this clever and interesting book. He may understand the papacy; but he does not understand the Gospel by which alone it can be effectively combated.

The new attempt to murder the King of Spain, so soon after the assassination of the Liberal Premier, Sr. Canalejas, gives us a glimpse into a more lurid side of the conflict. It may be assumed that the assassin who deprived Spain of one of her ablest and most honest and liberal-minded modern statesmen was actuated by clerical fanaticism. Spain is in the early stages of a clerical and anti-clerical struggle, which when the opposing parties come to real grips with each other will be fought out with a bitterness and relentlessness surpassing that which France witnessed a few years ago. The destructive influence of clericalism and Romanism in all its manifold forms has worked out its results more disastrously in Spain than in any other European country. The religious, social, economic, political results of the papacy when allowed to develop themselves unhindered by the forces which in other countries have mitigated them in a greater or less degree are seen in their full bloom in the Iberian Peninsula. And the fiery, cruel temper of the Spaniard, when his passions are deeply stirred, may make the battle a startling one when the crisis comes. A foretaste of what both sides are capable of was seen in the judicial murder of Ferrer, and in the insurrectionary disorders of Barcelona a few years ago. There have not been wanting indications that the volcano may burst with the suddenness of the Portuguese one, and sweep throne and Church away in a common ruin if the lesson of the Portuguese affair is not learned in time. That the king and his Government are frightened is evident. When the King of Spain, representative of the haughtiest of modern monarchies, frankly allows himself to be interviewed by the leader of the Republican Party in his country, as Alfonso did recently, and discusses with him the need of greater liberty

in the life of the nation, and expresses himself as being in favor of the widest extension of that liberty, and when his Government announces a whole sheaf of liberal measures, it is a sign of the times which cannot be overlooked. The dark side of the picture is that there are forces at work in the opposite direction, ready to hinder in every way any advance toward social, religious or political freedom. The Church of Rome knows that it is engaged in a life-and-death struggle, and in such a struggle its vaunted wisdom generally fails it, because of its incapacity to weigh aright the deepest forces of the human soul, the forces that display themselves in a spiritual crisis. In Spain the battle is near, and there can be little doubt on which side victory will rest.

In Belgium the religious question has again become a burning one. In the elections of last Summer the clerical party, which acquired power a good many years ago through the bitter feud that arose between the Liberals and the Socialists, but was steadily losing ground every time they had to go back to the electors till every one, including themselves, confidently expected the end of their long tenure of office, found their small majority slightly increased. The disappointment of the progressive forces was intense; the elation of the clerical party equally so. The progressive element, which was looking forward confidently to a term of office in which they would have an opportunity of reversing the reactionary measures of the clericals, saw the cup rudely dashed from their lips. The return of the clericals last Summer was not probably due to any increase of love for clericalism among the people. But the coal strike in England and other manifestations of the intense labor unrest frightened timid moderate politicians, and made them think it was not a propitious time for changing horses in the political term, and even Protestants were suspected in many constituencies of voting for a clerical rather than for a Socialist, when that was the choice presented to them. The clericals have been kept in power by a system of double and treble votes, which in the overwhelming majority of cases tells in favor of the clerical candidate. Thinking the last election indicates a return of favor with the people, the party in power refuse to alter an unfair electoral arrangement that keeps them in office. After vain negotiations the battle has

opened with the proclamation of a general strike. What the immediate issue of the strike will be it is too soon to say; but an antiquated and unfair electoral system, concocted to favor a particular party, cannot stand when once the people are roused to the point of declaring a general strike. So in Belgium the religious question, which for a time has been more or less dormant, is alive again. In France the religious question is not so prominent at the moment as in these, but it is still an effective element in many problems. In Portugal it is the dominant one.

But there is another side to these questions that has to be kept in view of a true understanding of the situation. Papal elections, laws, electoral struggles are important incidents in the prolonged warfare for spiritual freedom, and cannot be safely overlooked. But the full securing of spiritual freedom and its maintenance when secured can only be achieved by the employment of spiritual forces. These forces operate in a less open and startling way. They are often lost sight of by the superficial observer. But they are at work in all these countries, producing steadily increasing effects. To strengthen and foster these spiritual forces is a work in which all evangelical Christians can join heartily, whatever their political sympathies may be.—The Witness, Belfast, Friday, April 18, 1913.

CONVERSIONS TO ROME

Occasionally a person of social prominence, more often a woman, is converted to Rome, and the incident is advertised in the daily press and gains currency with its progress over the country. Such a case happened not long since and acquired a notoriety altogether out of proportion to its importance. God reigns, and the Church somehow survives the shock. Nevertheless, the publication of these infrequent incidents is annoying to those who know, and disconcerting to many who may not know their inwardness and may be unable to appreciate them at their true worth. These reports are sent broadcast and made much of by a body that is nothing if not a first-class organization. Instances of the other kind, news of conversions from Rome, are as carefully suppressed as these are advertised, and are not given the prominence they deserve by the authorities of

our communion. For instance, within the last four years seven Paulist fathers in New York City, members of the great teaching society of the Church of Rome, all high-class men, left that body, and one of them became a priest in our Church, but the incidents were not given headlines in the daily papers. A reason for the silence on this and similar occasions is stated above, another reason is an indifference that is reprehensible in a leading Church, another is a lack of a proper publicity bureau; all are the results of a certain lack of solidarity and organization in which respects the Roman Church excels. It is important to see that these cases have a proper place in the public eye.—The Churchman, April 26, 1913.

HANDS OFF, SAYS SPAIN

Civil Matters Distinct from Church Affairs, Says King

The Vatican is trying to make it appear that Spain is again completely submissive. The king's last message to the pope, however, presented by the Spanish ambassador, said:

"His majesty, intent on furthering the progress of the generous nation whose destinies he rules, feels his heart-throb for the fatherland he personifies, and shares in the anxiety of the Spaniards to advance unceasingly along the path of progress and culture. He knows that in order to secure such precious blessings, peace, material as well as spiritual, is indispensable, and his majesty feels confident that the holy father, making use of his authority and drawing inspiration from his inexhaustible spirit of charity, will co-operate with his Government to attain such a noble end. The mutual respect which the two sovereignties, the spiritual and the temporal, owe each other, while they maintain intact their respective independence, invites them to act in concert when they propose to solve questions of a mixed character in a Catholic nation such as Spain, and it does not exclude—on the contrary, IT EXACTS—THAT THEY OBSERVE ALL CIRCUMSPECTION IN THE EXERCISE OF THEIR INDEPENDENT AUTHORITY."

The pope in his reply said:

"From the depths of our paternal heart we address our humble prayer to the Almighty for the safety and prosperity of

the Catholic king and his august family, and for the greatness and glory of the noble Spanish nation. And since this greatness has, for centuries, been indissolubly united with fidelity to the Roman Church, we trust that for the common advantage of the ecclesiastical and civil ties, the bonds of cordial friendship which have ever bound Catholic Spain to this apostolic see may be maintained intact and be strengthened still more; and specially desire that in all questions of a mixed character, as you have opportunely remarked, the two powers may proceed in perfect harmony and mutual concord on the basis of the true and solid principles that regulate their respective attitudes."—The Sentinel, April 3, 1913.

WARNING BY A PERUVIAN
SAYS ROMAN CHURCH IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CRUELTY
TO NATIVES.

Source of Iniquity—True Nature of Church Shown Where She
Is Supreme.

BY EDUARDO F. FORGA.

As a Peruvian, born a Roman Catholic, I would warn every Protestant not to support the Roman Catholic mission which is to be sent to the Putumayo region. The atrocities enacted there are nothing else than the fruit of the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church itself. In those backward countries, where she reigns supremely, and where she has not been uplifted through purifying Protestant influences, her true nature appears. I have lived many years in my native country, and have traveled extensively.

Is it not remarkable that in Peru, where the Roman Catholic Church has been working, with the support of the state, for four hundred years, barring out the public worship of any other religion, very much of the same horrors should be committed as on the Congo, under the rule and for the profit of King Leopold II? Where have these native monsters — Peruvians, Colombians and others—been trained? These revolting acts, which have horrified the civilized world, are but the later fruits of that diabolical school of cruelty, the Inquisition, which during many centuries has molded the character of the Spanish Roman

Catholic peoples, and whose spell was broken in Lima, the capital of Peru, no longer than eighty years ago.

DELIGHT IN CRUELTY.

Hardness and cruelty are characteristics of these eminently Catholic peoples. They not only delight in cock-fights and frantically enjoy their bull-fights, but in every-day life they show **themselves extremely cruel** to all kinds of animals. The poor Indians of Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia, the miserable remnant of the great Inca empire, are treated everywhere as slaves by the descendants of the Spaniards, including the priests. In the heart-rending conquest of the Inca race, the Roman Catholic Church appears almost without exception as the instigator of all the iniquity committed against them, from the day that Friar Valverde suggested to Pizarro, the conqueror of Peru, and to his men that the Inca emperor, Atahualpa, should be treacherously killed because he would not accept Catholicism, to the present time, when the unhappy Indians slave away a wretched existence to keep the demoralizing church feasts going, and to pay the fees of the priests who fatten on them.

POSING AS AN ANGEL.

It is, therefore revolting to see how the Roman Catholic Church, posing in this country as an angel of light, has, under the plea that Roman Catholicism is the state religion in Peru, caused an appeal to be made to its own people and Protestants alike for funds to send a Roman Catholic mission to the Putumayo.—The Sentinel, April 3, 1913.

Roman Interference with American Liberty

Roman papers are sold in the streets without Protestant hindrance. But read the following:

"At the instigation of a Roman Catholic priest one of our agents was arrested by a Roman Catholic policeman in a Western city for selling the 'Protestant Magazine' containing an installment of 'A Convent Tragedy.' He was taken before a Roman Catholic official and fined \$5 and costs (\$12.50), making a total of \$17.50. The mayor remitted the fine and another official remitted a part of the costs, leaving the agent to pay \$10 for the privilege of selling a Protestant publication in Protestant America. We hope to make a full statement of this case later." — The Protestant Magazine, June, 1913.

Please Pay Your Subscriptions

Many of our subscribers are in arrears of payment. You need the magazine. But we need the money to publish it. Our bills come promptly and our payments of subscriptions should come promptly. Some of our readers do not watch the date of expiration on their address wrappers, and they wait for us to mail them special bills. If we were to mail bills and receipts to all our subscribers it would cost us a great deal of money, time and labor, which cost is entirely needless if our friends will watch their dates. The date on your label is your bill. When you pay we change the date, and then it is your receipt. Please look to-day and see whether you have a bill or a receipt on your wrapper. And if it is a bill, that is to say, if it shows a past date, please send us the money, for the printer and the paper man, and the postal service all need it, and all come to us for it. Please send it quickly.

If you have been receiving the magazine regularly and have never paid for it, and yet find a date of expiration on your wrapper that means somebody else has paid for it for you for ONE year. When the year expires you are expected either to renew the subscription yourself or notify us to discontinue it. If you can afford to renew at your own expense we shall be glad to have you do so. If not, tell us so; and if you value the magazine we may find some friend who will subscribe to it for you so that you may have it free of cost. Friends with whom we have made special arrangements by the help of others will understand that this appeal does not apply to them.

Those who can afford to do so will aid our missionary work greatly by contributing to a fund to pay for the magazine to be sent to those who cannot afford it, and to public men and Romanists who are unlikely to subscribe for themselves.

One Thousand New Subscribers Wanted

Some of our friends are helping to secure them. Are you helping? Let every reader of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC be a missionary to extend its circulation. Lend your magazine and increase the number of readers if you can't help increase the number of subscribers.

Lend it to Romanists who may profit by the reading, but who will not see it otherwise.

BUILD YOURSELF A LIBRARY

PREMIUMS.—We give the following books to those who want them, if they ask for them, who send us new paid subscribers. They are not given to the new subscribers, but are only for those who work for us in securing new subscribers.

For one new subscriber your choice of "Geraldine de Lisle," "The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome," "The Escaped Nun," "Aimee's Marriage," "Political Romanism."

For two new subscribers, "The Martyr in Black," together with one of the following: "Papal Merchandize," "The Waldenses," "Paul Errington," "Babylon"; or a choice of "The Hand of God and Satan in Modern History," "St. Luke's Garden," "The Holy Gospel," "Protestant and Roman Prisons."

For three new subscribers, "The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome," "Foxe's Book of Martyrs," "Letters to Pope Pius X," with "The Martyr in Black," or any three of the following: "The Escaped Nun," "The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome," "Political Romanism," "Aimee's Marriage," "Geraldine de Lisle."

For four new subscribers, "Spain from Within," Rafael Shaw; "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome," or "Forty Years in the Church of Christ," Father Chiniquy; Peru.

Substitutions may be made for other books of equal value. For a greater number of new subscribers premiums of greater value will be awarded.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Specially designed for the instruction of Protestants regarding Romanism and the enlightenment and conversion of Roman Catholics to the Evangelical Faith.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., PUBLISHER.

331 West 57th St., New York.

Subscription per Year.....One Dollar and Fifty Cents.

To ministers and missionaries. One Dollar per year.

Ten copies to one address, One Dollar and Twenty-five Cents per year.
Single copies, Fifteen Cents each.

Sample copies in quantities of twenty or more will be sold to one person at ten cents each and mailed free to addresses sent to the publisher.

Make all checks, drafts and money orders payable to the Treasurer of Christ's Mission, 1112 Times Building, New York.

Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 W. 57th Street, New York.

The date on the address label, on the wrapper, indicates when the subscription expires. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed. Therefore no other acknowledgment will be made of the payment of subscriptions in renewal. Acknowledgment by letter is laborious, expensive and consumes much time and is unnecessary.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.
